

**Comment on the proposed designation of *S. pseudobrowniana* Kempf, 1971 as the type species of *Scottia* Brady & Norman, 1889 (Crustacea, Ostracoda)**  
(Case 2896; see BZN 51: 304–305; 52: 178)

Renate Matzke-Karasz  
*Wilhelmshöher Allee 182, 34119 Kassel, Germany*

I am fully familiar with the situation mentioned in this case, having recently published a study of *Scottia* and allied genera (Matzke-Karasz, 1995). *Scottia* was based on the living species later called *S. pseudobrowniana*, and I entirely support the proposals.

**Additional reference**

**Matzke-Karasz, R.** 1995. Aktuelle Gattungs- und Artmerkmale bei *Scottia*, *Cyclocypris* und *Mesocypris* (Ostracoda). *Sonderveröffentlichungen des Geologischen Instituts der Universität zu Köln*, no. 97.

**Comments on the proposed conservation of *Lironeca* Leach, 1818 (Crustacea, Isopoda) as the correct original spelling**  
(Case 2915; see BZN 51: 224–226; 52: 67–69, 178–179)

(1) Thomas E. Bowman  
*Department of Invertebrate Zoology, National Museum of Natural History,  
Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*

Three of the authors (Drs Holthuis, Brandt and Bruce; see BZN 52: 67–69) who have commented on this case have not addressed the key point (BZN 51: 224, para. 3) that Leach's publishing eight generic names as anagrams of Caroline or Carolina and another that failed by a single easily mistaken letter ('v' for 'r') to be a ninth anagram constitutes 'in the original publication itself ... clear evidence of an inadvertent error' (Article 32c(ii) of the Code). Holthuis and Bruce do not dispose of this argument at all, but simply declare that there is no such evidence. Brandt says that printing errors are irrelevant, but if this were so the Code would not contain Article 32c(ii).

(2) Ernest H. Williams, Jr. & Lucy Bunkley Williams  
*Department of Marine Sciences, University of Puerto Rico, P.O. Box 908, Lajas,  
Puerto Rico 00667*

We agree with Dr Bowman in his comment above: Drs Holthuis, Brandt and Bruce do not address the principal argument. Their comments are of interest in providing additional background and history but do nothing to refute the proposals in the application. Since they have introduced auxiliary issues we will state a primary point, even though it is technically irrelevant. The *Lironeca* spelling would have the positive

effect of preserving the intent of the original author (which is beyond dispute: see BZN 51: 224, para. 4), while the *Livoneca* spelling would have the negative effect of promoting a misspelling or misprint. We trust the ruling will preserve reality with *Lironeca*, not the surrealism of the *Livoneca* spelling.

(3) Gianni Bello

*Istituto Arion, C.P. 61, 70042 Mola di Bari, Italy*

I wish to support the proposal by Williams & Bowman to conserve *Lironeca* as the correct original spelling of the name of a genus of parasitic isopods.

I agree with all the points in the application, and in addition I would like to stress that the vast majority of zoological names have meanings even though this is not obligatory. These meanings are very helpful to workers who have to memorize names. Unfortunately in Leach's time Recommendation 25B of the Code did not exist, and he did not state the derivation of his names of parasitic isopod genera. Nevertheless his intention is perfectly evident: eight of the names are based on anagrams of the personal name Caroline or Carolina. The spelling *Livoneca*, on the other hand, has no meaning. I maintain that wherever possible the original intention of the author of scientific names should be respected.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of *Aspidiphorus* Ziegler in Dejean, 1821 (Insecta, Coleoptera) as the correct original spelling, and the placement of ASPIDIPHORIDAE Kiesenwetter, 1877 (1859) on the Official List (Case 2918; see BZN 52: 44-47)**

Alfred F. Newton, Jr. and Margaret K. Thayer

*Department of Zoology, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Illinois 60605, U.S.A.*

The application by Dr Joseph McHugh clearly sets out the relevant facts concerning the name *Aspidiphorus* and we completely agree with the proposed conservation of this spelling over the original spelling *Arpidiphorus*.

We also agree with the facts presented concerning the family names ASPIDIPHORIDAE and SPHINDIDAE, but strongly disagree with the conclusion that priority should be followed here and ASPIDIPHORIDAE be used over SPHINDIDAE.

Until new data on both family-group names was presented recently (Lawrence & Newton, 1995; Pakaluk, Ślipiński & Lawrence, 1994; and para. 5 of the present application) SPHINDIDAE was thought to have priority over ASPIDIPHORIDAE, but more precise dating of the part of Jacquelin du Val's (1859-1863) work in which SPHINDIDAE was established suggests a date of 1860 or 1861, after establishment of CONIPORIDAE Thomson, 1859 (from which ASPIDIPHORIDAE derives its date, as indicated in para. 8 of the application). These facts and a recent taxonomic consensus that *Aspidiphorus* belongs in the SPHINDIDAE do require adoption of the senior name ASPIDIPHORIDAE for the family according to the Code.

There is no doubt that the name SPHINDIDAE is better known than ASPIDIPHORIDAE and it has, to our knowledge, been universally used for this family whether